



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

HW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/353,974	07/15/1999	VIKTORS BERSTIS	AT9-99-123	4395
35525	7590	02/14/2006	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			TO, JENNIFER N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/353,974	BERSTIS ET AL.	
	Examiner Jennifer N. To	Art Unit 2195	

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are pended for examination.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-11, 13, 15, and 17-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anti-cult “Cache Directories – delete them sometimes”-  
“alt.religion.scientology”, 01/30/1997.

4. As per claim 1, Anti-cult teaches the claimed invention, comprising:  
initiating a session (using the Netscape browser to start a session);  
requesting a first web page (in order to encrypt a web page, a step of requesting a webpage must be included. Anti-cult teaches encrypting a web page, therefore Anti-cult inherently teaches requesting a first web page);  
receiving the web page (in order to encrypt a web page, the steps of requesting a webpage, and receiving the web page must be included. Anti-cult teaches encrypting a web page, therefore Anti-cult inherently teaches receiving the web page);  
encrypting the web page (the Netscape cache directory is in an encrypted device drive. The encrypted device drive encrypts the web page received by Netscape); and

caching the web page (the default option of the Netscape browser is to cache the received web page. Anti-cult put the Netscape cache in the encrypted device drive. As such, the encrypted device driver automatically encrypts the received web page before caching it in the Netscape browser cache directory).

5. As per claim 3, Anti-cult teaches the encryption is not supported by the browser (the encrypted device drive's encryption program is outside the control of Netscape).

6. As per claim 5, Anti-cult teaches that wherein the step of caching the web page further comprises providing a remote cache location (Netscape allows user to select any location as the cache location).

7. As per claim 7, Anti-cult teaches defining a path for storing the web page that directs the web page to memory locations for encrypted data (Netscape cache directory to the encrypted device drive by defining the path thereto).

8. As per claim 8, Ant-cult teaches that wherein web page information that is cached and then paged is paged as encrypted web page information (the web page information is cached and pages in the encrypted device drive as a encrypted web page information).

9. As per claim 9, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1.

10. As per claim 10, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1. In addition, Anti-cult teaches the decrypting of the cache content prior to the usage by the browser.

11. As per claims 11, 13, 15, and 17-21, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 3, 5, 7-11 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 2, 4, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anti-cult “Cache Directories – delete them sometimes”- “alt.religion.scientology”, 01/30/1997, as applied in claim 1 above, and in view of Kesinger “Two very simple solution”, “comp.infosystems.www.authoring.html”, 10/26/1995.

14. As per claims 2, 4, 12 and 14, Anti-cult teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Anti-cult did not specifically teach coding the web page using a browser supported encryption algorithm.

15. However, Kesinger teaches coding the web page using a browser supported encryption algorithm (the usage of the browser to encrypt the web page in the browser's cache).

16. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Anti-cult and Kesinger because Kesinger teaching of coding the web page using a browser supported encryption algorithm would improve the integrity of Anti-cult's system by allowing only the preauthorized user to browse the web page.

17. Claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anti-cult "Cache Directories – delete them sometimes"- "alt.religion.scientology", 01/30/1997, as applied in claim 1 above, and in view of Davis "Sharing Netscape cache?", "comp.unix.admin", 6/4/1997.

18. As per claims 6 and 16, Anti-cult teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Anti-cult did not specifically teach the browser cache is password protected from unauthorized users.

19. However, Davis teaches the browser cache is password protected from unauthorized users (Unix version of Netscape create a cache in a user's own directory

and only the user can access the Netscape's cache. The user directory is password protected from unauthorized users).

20. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Anti-cult and Davis because Davis teaching of the browser cache is password protected from unauthorized users would improved the integrity of Ant-cult's system by providing a secure environment to share a cache directory between multiple users.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

21. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

**Heusen**, ("Netscape security problem with cache files", "comp.security.misc", 7/16/1996) states that, for the Unix version of Netscape, only the person who wrote the cache file access it. In the Unix system, the person needs to use password to access his account. In other words, the user needs to use password to access his/her cache files.

**Jamil**, ("Re: Wish-Make Offline Browsing More Convenience" "netscape.public.mozilla.wishlist", 4/1/1998) suggest to use "encrypted cache" for browser to protect the cache privacy.

**Fagard**, ("Copyright in HTML 3?") suggest to use the browser to encrypt the web page prior to storing it in the cache.

**Rick**, ("About BC WIPE", "alt.privacy.anon-server", 12/20/1998) move the Netscape Cache to an encrypted storage container, Scramdisk. As such, the cache file is encrypted before caching in the encrypted storage container.

**Baentsch at el.**, ("Worl-Wide Web Caching –The application level view of the internet", IEEE communications magazines, vol. 35, No. 6, June 1997, pages 170-178) discuss the option of caching precious documents in an encrypted form.

**Simpson**, ("Announce – ScramDisk – Free Windows 95/98 hard Disk Encryption Program", "sci.crypt", 7/14/1998) teaches the existence of different encryption algorithms to support an encrypted storage container.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer N. To whose telephone number is (571) 272-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 6AM- 3:30 PM, F 6AM- 2:30 PM.

24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer N To  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2195

*Mengel, Jennifer N.*  
MENGEL, JENNIFER N.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
CHARGE DATE: 07-17-2009